facing the threat of foreign aggression. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has claimed that Pakistan can manufacture a nuclear device whenever required. This is a serious threat to our country's defence. The Government should assure the nation about our capacity to meet the threat of nuclear divice. Pakistan is arming itself alarmingly. They are purchasing arms from the United States and their purchase during the current year has shown a 7-fold increase. Pakistan is also purchasing arms from China. It has also entered into an agreement with that country for manufacture of missiles. Arms worth billions received by Pakistan to fight the Najibullah regime of Afghanistan which were to be given to Mujahideen are still with Pakistan and these arms are finding their way to India. India is a peace-loving country, having no intention to wage a war against any country. In the past also, wars were thrust upon us. It is necessary that India should not be caught napping in case Pakistan decides to follow an adventurist policy. I have full confidence in our Government to look after our country's defence. However, after the pronouncement by the Prime Minister of Pakistan on 1-8-93 about Pakistan's capability to manufacture a nuclear device, our country needs to be reassured, which is all the more necessary in view of the political instability in that country. Madam, through you, I would like the Government to carefully consider the present alarming situation on our borders and do the needful to develop this capability in our country.

———

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL) 1993-94 (AUGUST, 1993)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKHAR MURTHY) : Madam, I beg to lay on the Table of the House a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for the year 1993-94 (August, 1993).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House is adjourned for lunch till 2.30.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-four minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch, at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock, **The Vice-Chairman (Shri Md. Salim)** in the chair.

(i) Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (amendment) Ordinance, 1993.

(ii) The Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Amendment) Bill, 1993.—*Contd.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : Shri Viduthalai Virumbi to continue his speech.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, continuing my speech which I began two days ago, I would like to point out that under this Act, i. e. the Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, a person can be detained up to six months without his case being referred to the Advisory Board. Now, what is our past experience ? In 1992, 75,212 kgs. of Narcotic and Psychotropic Substances were seized; more than 11,500 arrests were made but the Central Government as well as the State Governments have issued detention orders under which only 97 cases were booked and only 80 persons were arrested and detained. I am more worried about this because there is a news item in the 'Indian Express' dated 21st June, 1993. The caption of the news item is, "Tamil Nadu emerges conduit for drug pedlars on the run." In this report it is said—I quote :

> "With the heat turned on the organised gang of smugglers in Bombay after the bomb blasts, Tamil Nadu is emerging as a key transit rout for west-ward-bound drug traffickers."

The situation is alarming because when Shri Rajesh Pilot visited Tamil Nadu on 2nd June, he said that even RDX explosives had been smuggled into Tamil Nadu. If it had been found, I feel the Madras bomb blast would not have taken place. From this angle I say that this is more menacing. After the doors of Thailand were bolted, the smugglers have selected India as a stop-over. Recently, some of the international gangs had entered into Indian soil and most of them actually went scot-free. They have booked more cases of smuggling. For example, in 1990 they booked 37,809 cases; in 1991, 36,754 cases and in 1992, 39,871 cases; but the number of arrested persons was only 876 in 1990, 1571 in